



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/939,064 09/29/97 KAMACHI

T SONY-P7815

EXAMINER

LM02/0608

PHILIP M SHAW
LIMBACH AND LIMBACH
2001 FERRY BUILDING
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4262

NGUYEN, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2773

DATE MAILED:

06/08/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/939,064

Applicant(s)
KAMACHI

Examiner
Thomas Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2773



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on APRIL 12, 1999 CPA

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAIL ACTION

I. *Specification*

The **title** of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

II. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. *Claim 1-2,5-7,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott et al. US Patent 5,621,904 in view of Southgate U.S. Patent 5,487,143.*

As per claim 1,5-6: Elliott discloses a system and method of an image display a main window for displaying main information and a sub window for displaying accompanying information associated with main information, and automatically arrangement changing the display position move to main window within a preset predetermined value, and arranging of sub window to a position adjacent to main window (col.2 , line 40 to col.3, line 30; FIG.2), although Elliott's description of related art discloses user able manually move the sub-window to user specified position (col.1) but Elliott does not teaches in detail of user-specified position for sub window move to main window. However, Southgate discloses a user interface control allow the user to move from one area to area (abstract, claim 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to modify Elliott's system using Southgate's user interface control for moving a display position of sub window upon user-specified position, because it allows user composition of screen layout for utilize display spaces effective and efficiently.

As per claim 2,7,10: Recite from claim 1, Elliott discloses a system for display a sub window adjacent to main window within a preset predetermined value, but Elliott's system discloses automatic arrangement the horizontal line in reserve order which is lower side instead upper side alignment of both windows (lower side of subwindow with lower side of mainwindow see FIG.2). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention for change sub window coordinate to alignment the upper sides instead lower side of main window and sub window, because organizing the display window this way in some cases may maximize the display area.

2. *Claim 3-4,8-9,11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott et al. US Patent 5,621,904 in view of Southgate U.S. Patent 5,487,143 and further in view of Liles et al. US Patent 5,880,731.*

As per claim 3,8,11: Recite from claim 1, but Elliott's image display system does not discloses the main window displays a 3D Virtual Reality and sub windows display a chat perform via an avatar. However, Liles teaches present invention system relates to a virtual space which allows avatar freely move to desired position in a shared in 3D virtual space (abstract, col.3-4, Fig.13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to combine Elliott's position windows display and Liles's disclosures for

obtaining an image display which main window in 3D virtual reality space and sub window of a movable chat avatar, because this would enhance system performance and usability.

As per claim 4,9,12: Recite from claim 3, Liles's system describes in virtual world 3D graphic data network communication with the server (col.5-6) but does not disclose any particular language. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to combine to select a well known VRML language for implement VR 3D graphics because this would enhance system performance.

III. **Prior Art**

3. The *Prior Art* made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Norman Morse, et al., U.S Patent No. 5,802,296 discloses a supervisory powers that provide additional control over images on computers system displays to users interacting via computer systems.

III. **Conclusion**

4. Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 308-6606 may be used for formal communications or (703) 305-9731 for informal or draft communications. Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document. Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., 6th Floor (Receptionist).


Serial Number: 08/939,064
Art Unit: 2773

5

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Thomas Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 308-7240. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8:00 - 6:00 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the workgroup 2773 Examiner's contact person, Crescelle dela Torre, can be reached at (703) 305-9782.
6. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Thomas T. Nguyen

June 3, 1999



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2773